UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/681,068 10/07/2003 | | Andrew S. Hildebrant | 10030549-1 | 8619 |
| 63448 Gregory W. Ost | 7590 06/08/201 terloth | 0 | EXAMINER | |
| Holland & Hart | | | LEIVA, FRANK M | |
| P.O. Box 8749 Denver, CO 802 | 201 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3714 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/08/2010 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| 10/681,068 | HILDEBRANT ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| FRANK M. LEIVA | 3714 | |

| | | TTO GREEN ELEVA | 07 14 | |
|--|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| The MAILING DATE of this | communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspondence address | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>17 May 2010</u> FAILS | TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. | |
| The reply was filed after a final reject application, applicant must timely file application in condition for allowand for Continued Examination (RCE) in periods: | le one of the following e; (2) a Notice of Appe | replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | it, or other evidence, which with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a | places the Request |
| a) The period for reply expires | | | | |
| no event, however, will the statutor Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked | y period for reply expire la , check either box (a) or (| dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH | g date of the final rejection. | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECT Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 have been filed is the date for purposes of det | CFR 1.136(a). The date ermining the period of ext | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. ension and the corresponding amount | of the fee. The appropriate ex | tension fee |
| under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply re may reduce any earned patent term adjustmen NOTICE OF APPEAL | ceived by the Office later | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _ filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR Notice of Appeal has been filed, an AMENDMENTS | 41.37(a)), or any exter | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the app | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed (a) They raise new issues that we | ould require further cor | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | e |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new n (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place appeal; and/or | | · | ducing or simplifying the iss | sues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claim NOTE: (See 37 CFF | R 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compli | | | empliant Amendment (PTOL | 324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the6. Newly proposed or amended claim | | | timely filed amendment car | nceling the |
| non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed how the new or amended claims we | ould be rejected is prov | | ll be entered and an explan | ation of |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from considerat | ion: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | <i>.</i> | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed because applicant failed to provide was not earlier presented. See 37 | a showing of good and | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed entered because the affidavit or oth showing a good and sufficient reason | er evidence failed to o | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fails to p | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is € REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/C | | n of the status of the claims after e | ntry is below or attached. | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has See Continuation Sheet. | | t does NOT place the application i | n condition for allowance be | ecause: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Dis</i>13. ☐ Other: | closure Statement(s). (| PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /Peter D. Vo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art U | nit 3714 | | | |
| | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented by the applicant are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Argument 1; "In response to the above argument, the Examiner asserted that the phrase "required memory" is equal to the phrase "minimum number of flip-flops". See, 317 5MC31C3 Final Off ice Action, p. 3. Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that the Examiner is reading the phrase "required memory" out of context. To anticipate claim 1, Agrawal needs to disclose more than just the existence of a "required memory", and instead needs to disclose "determining a required memory needed to execute the plurality of test vector\$, Agrawal does not disclose this." The examiner points to the definition of "required" as "being necessary to complete the function" such is the minimum number of flip-flops" that is "memory units" necessary (required) to execute the tests vectors. Nothing more has been read into the term "required memory". Furthermore, applicants own admission that a flip-flop is a memory unit in which the memory is measured, thus determining the minimum number of flip-flops to run the test vector (column 4 line 40-43).

Argument 2; "Applicants note that the "number of flip-flops" referred to by Agrawal in col. 4:4040 is a number of flip-flops in an unknown state, which number of flip-flops need to be initialized and tested. The number of flip-flops disclosed by Agrawal is not a number of flip-flops that is "required to execute [a] plurality of test vectors", but is simply a number of flip-flops that exists to be tested. In the context of Agrawal, it makes no sense to read a test file having a plurality of test vectors and then determine "a required memory needed to execute the plurality of test vectors", because the number of flip-flops being tested is fixed irrespective of the test vectors. If anything, Agrawal needs to determine a required number of vectors for initializing or testing a known number of flip-flops." The examiner points to column 4 lines 50-53 where the cost function corresponds to an unknown number of flip-flops, those in an unknown state, and by trial vectors minimize the number of flip-flops (column 4 lines 57-60).

After considering the after final arguments the examiner deems the arguments not persuasive and the rejections still proper, further amendments are necessary for the claims to overcome the rejections. The request does not place the application in condition of allowance.